





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Lyrisis Members and Sloan Foundation

REPORT

OF

SELECT COMMITTEE,

RELATIVE TO

THE PETITION OF

CHARLES CARROLL M^CTAVISH.

REPORT

SELECT COMMITTEE

RELATIVE TO

THE POSITION OF

CHARLES CARROLL M'LAISH.

REPORT.

The Committee to whom was referred the petition of Charles Carroll McTavish beg leave to report:

That in 1852, leave was granted to introduce a bill to change the name of Charles Carroll McTavish to Charles Carroll.

That in accordance with the leave so granted a bill was introduced, and made the special order of the day. That Charles Carroll caused to be presented to the House a petition against the passage of said bill, setting forth his reasons for objecting thereto. That said McTavish then caused to be presented to the House a counter petition correcting, as he alleges, some mistakes in the petition of Charles Carroll, and requires the passage of said bill.

That with the case thus fully laid before it, the House of Delegates on the 4th of March, 1852, page 313 House Journal, unanimously ordered said bill to be indefinitely postponed.

No new light, other than that given to the House in 1852, has been thrown upon the subject, during its consideration by the Committee. And every thing brought before them only strengthens and fortifies the conclusion to which the House of Delegates came in 1852. And your Committee respectfully think that until some new facts can be adduced in the premises that conclusion should be final and undisturbed.

Your Committee consider that a name is private property, and though the same may be in common with many individuals, yet your committee consider that it is an unwarrantable encroachment upon private rights for the Legislature to give to any one upon his application, the name of another, when that other comes forward and protests against it. A name is the designation of individual identity, and that here we are fortunately free from the sounding titles which are in less happy countries called into requisition to adorn and distinguish it, it is still not without its characteristics for good or evil, and remunerates the child for the virtuous distinction an ancestor has won for it. It is inseparable from the

life of the man, and no one should be allowed to assume a name honored by another against that other's will.

In the case before your Committee, Charles Carroll McTavish desires to assume a name that has been highly distinguished in the history of the country, and by the noble patriotism of those who have borne it, made it especially dear to Maryland. It is identified with her earliest history, and must live in unfading honor upon the charter of American liberty. Those to whom it belongs by inheritance, though desired by many to take the designation given to it by the signer of the Declaration of Independence, have declined to do so, and left it alone, the pride and honor and property of Maryland.

The Committee must confess some surprise at finding that he who proposes to assume this name is the son of a British Consul, was elected a member of the British Parliament from the town of Dundalk, in Ireland, that he sat in said Parliament, and that he has represented her Britanic Majesty in the diplomatic department of the Court of Saint Cloud and the Sublime Porte.

Your Committee think, with all respect, that such a name should at least be preserved sacred to the country it has honored, and if the House did not owe the prompt rejection of Mr. McTavish's application to the present and to reason, they owe it to gratitude and the past.

THOS. T. HUTCHINS,

JAMES MORRIS,

SAM. HAMBLETON,

SAMUEL COX,

Committee.

